

REMARKS

The claim objections to claims 22 and 24 are avoided by the amendments herein.

The rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is avoided by eliminating from this claim (and in fact from all the other independent claims) the phrase relating to the method occurring upon the occurrence of an error. In the claims, an error is assumed to have occurred.

Claims 13-18 and 20-24 are rejected as unpatentable over Shimomura in view of Sadler. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Shimomura in view of Sadler further in view of Boehmer.

Claim 13 clearly distinguishes for the following reasons. Claim 13 recites querying components in modules in a sequence opposite to that of a printable media transport direction. At page 4, last paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner agrees that Shimomura does not teach testing components in a direction opposite to a media flow path. The Examiner does state at page 5, lines 5-7 of the Office Action that it would be known to someone of ordinary skill in the art to test all components in sequence regardless of the sequence or order and cites columns 5-6, lines 65-67 and 1-9 of Shimomura. However, at the cited portion of Shimomura, a sequence formulation is discussed wherein a sequence formulation section 23 formulates a control sequence for repairing the fault. However, the control sequence being referred to here has nothing to do with the printable media

means one control module followed by another control module in a sequence order.

Significantly, the Examiner does not cite a secondary reference to satisfy this critical deficiency of Shimomura. However, after acknowledging at page 9, fourth line from the bottom, that Shimomura is silent as to which order the components are tested and is silent as to the components being tested one by one in a sequential order, the Examiner states that testing the operation of units in reverse flow order does not appear to change the expected outcome and does not appear to be advantageous. Therefore, the order in which the units are tested would have been a simple matter of preference to those skilled in the art. However, this is not true for the following reasons.

Attention is drawn to specification page 8, line 5 through page 9, line 2 of Applicants' Substitute Specification. This portion of Applicants' specification teaches that the reverse direction of checking the modules and correcting the error (if possible) is clearly advantageous from modules which process the printable media. If a paper jam occurs in one of the modules, it becomes clear that emptying the paper transport path (see pages 8, 9 in line 15 of Substitute Specification) enables the further modules to empty/clear the paper transport path as well. On the other hand, if the module checking and paper transport path clearance is not done in the reverse direction, but in the regular direction of the printable media transport direction, than the paper sheets which are clear from upstream modules would still collide with the

jammed downstream paper and thus the overall paper jam would still be increased rather than corrected. This problem is solved with the invention of claim 13. Thus, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, testing the operation of the units in reverse flow thus changes the outcome and *does have a significant advantage*. For this reason, reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claim 13 is respectfully requested.


The remaining independent claims all recite similar language as claim 13 whereby the components and modules are queried in the sequence opposite to that of a printable media transport path direction. Therefore these claims all distinguish in the manner discussed above with respect to claim 13. Independent claim 22 was amended to add the language "sequence" to make this claim similar to the other independent claims which recite the term "sequence".

The dependent claims depending from the independent claims are allowable at least for the reasons noted with respect to the independent claims but also by reciting additional features which in combination with the independent claim features are patentable.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or to credit any overpayment to account no. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. #27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department-6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants
CUSTOMER NO. 26574

CH1\6017438.1